IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH JULY 2007 / 13TH ASHADHA 1929

RP.No. 473 of 2007()

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WA.556/2007 Dated 13/04/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/APPELLANT IN W.A.

V.RAGHUNATHAN, SECRETARY,
ARYANADU SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD.NO.T
539, ARYANADU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.ELVIN PETER P.J.

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS IN W.A.
---

1. V.SARALA, CHIEF ACCOUNTANT,
   ARYANADU SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK,
   ARYANADU, NEDUMANGADU TALUK, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE ARYANADU SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE
   BANK, ARYANADU, NEDUMANGADU TALUK,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

3. THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
   ARYANADU SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK,
   ARYANADU, NEDUMANGADU TALUK, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT.

4. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
   CO-OPERATION (C) DEPARTMENT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

5. THE JOINT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE
   SOCIETIES (GENERAL), VANCHIYOOR,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

6. THE KERALA CO-OPERATIVE TRIBUNAL,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.K.RAMAKUMAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/07/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN & ANTONY DOMINIC JJ.

R.P.NO.473 OF 2007 IN
W.A.NO.556 OF 2007

Dated this the 4th day of July, 2007

O R D E R

Raman,J.

This is a petition seeking review of the judgment in W.A.No.556/2007. The specific contention now raised in the review petition is that under Rule 186(1)(A) of the Kerala Co-operative Societies Rules, B.A. degree holder in Sanskrit, Islamic History, Politics or such other B.A. Degree, which has no nexus with Commerce or Banking is eligible to be treated as qualified, provided he possessed J.D.C. So the petitioner being possessed M.Com. Degree mainly deals with Commerce and Co-operative Banking and having possessed J.D.C. cannot be treated as not qualified person. First of all this contention as is raised now was not raised neither before the learned Single nor in the appeal. Further, the remedy of a review is not for re-hearing of the matter.

2. We have considered the relevant provision and also the qualification possessed by the petitioner and decided the case. Hence, if at all the contention is that interpretation placed on the section is not

correct, the remedy is to file an appeal and not a review petition. We find no error apparent on the face of the record.

Review Petition is dismissed.

P.R. RAMAN,
Judge.

ANTONY DOMINIC,
Judge.

kcv.